To: Beck, Nancy[Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]

From: Bowman, Liz

Sent: Mon 5/15/2017 10:41:56 PM

Subject: FW: Reporter seeking update on status of previous request

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

e?

From: prizzuto@bna.com [mailto:prizzuto@bna.com]

Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 10:36 AM

To: Press < Press@epa.gov>

Subject: Reporter seeking update on status of previous request

The deadline for my request is fast approaching and I haven't heard from EPA. Could you update me please? Any chance for an interview this week as requested 2 weeks ago? What about the numerical data I requested?

Pat

Pat Rizzuto

Chemicals Reporter

Bloomberg BNA, Inc.

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

email: prizzuto@bna.com

mair. prizzatota ona.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Rizzuto, Denise Pat

Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2017 12:01 PM To: 'press@epa.gov' < press@epa.gov' >

Subject: Reporter requesting interview with EPA on new chemicals program & requesting

numerical figures to illustrate status of reviews

I have two requests: 1st an interview with Wendy Cleland-Hamnet, Jeffrey Morris, or other appropriate senior OCSPP or OPPT official regarding the new chemicals program. The interview is for a special report giving me some flexibility as to when, but I would like to have the interview no later than May 22. It could be in person or by phone, although in person would be ideal.

2nd numerical figures about the status of PMN and MCAN reviews

- I. Illustrative questions I need to ask an EPA official (final questions may vary as I speak with more stakeholders prior to my interview with EPA)
- 1) Do you think the number of PMNs, in particular, but also MCANs that are under review by OPPT's new chemicals program is a problem?
- 2) What health or environmental issues are raising questions as EPA reviews the new chemicals and how is that similar or different than prior to Lautenberg?
- 3) Prior to Lautenberg, I'm told the agency often tied data requests to production volume, for example, it would let a chemical enter commerce but required data once production volume hit particular targets. Now, I'm told the EPA is more often wanting the data before the chemical is allowed to enter commerce. What's EPA's perspective?

- 4) I've heard industry speakers say Lautenberg codified new chemical review practices the agency already had. Is that an accurate description?
- 5) What are they questions raised by Lautenberg, requirements the EPA must meet or presumptions about new chemicals being made that are causing the logiam?
- 6) What solutions are you considering?
- II. Figures about new chemicals program that I am seeking ahead of that interview
- 7) How many PMNs were under review as of April 30, 2017.
- 8) How many MCANS were under review as of April 30, 2017.
- 9) How many PMNs, and how many MCANs have been withdrawn since June 22, 2016 (i.e. since Lautenberg went into effect)?
- 10) How many PMNs and how many MCANS have been allowed to enter commerce since June 22, 2016? (I realize these are posted, and I recently counted 63, but I want to make sure I'm counting them correctly.)
- 11) How many action letters has EPA sent since June 22, 2016?
- 12) What's the range of study types—acute, chronic, dermal, multigene repro., etc.--that the agency has said it would like to receive?

Pat

Pat Rizzuto

Chemicals Reporter

Bloomberg BNA, Inc.

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

email: prizzuto@bna.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.